

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SAN JOSE DIVISION

13
14 MARTHA JANE MCNEELY,
15 Plaintiff,
16 v.
17 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
18 ENERGY, et al.,
19 Defendants.
20

21 Case No. [5:14-cv-03509-EJD](#)

22
23
24
25
26
27
28 **ORDER GRANTING FEDERAL
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS,
GRANTING GENERAL ELECTRIC'S
MOTION TO DISMISS, DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND
GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS'
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

29 Re: Dkt. Nos. 30, 34, 45, 49

30
31 Plaintiff Martha McNeely, appearing pro se, brings a variety of claims arising from (1) her
32 requests under the federal Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") and Privacy Act ("PA") and (2)
33 injuries she allegedly suffered from childhood medical treatments. Defendants are a range of
34 federal government agencies and employees (together, the "Federal Defendants") and private
35 entities.

36 Case No.: [5:14-cv-03509-EJD](#)
37 **ORDER GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, GRANTING
38 GENERAL ELECTRIC'S MOTION TO DISMISS, DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
39 SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
40 SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

1 Before the Court are the Federal Defendants' motion to dismiss, General Electric
2 Company's ("GE") motion to dismiss, McNeely's motion for summary judgment, and the Federal
3 Defendants' motion for summary judgment. McNeely's motion will be denied and the other
4 motions will be granted.

5 **I. BACKGROUND**

6 McNeely submitted two requests for records to the Department of Energy ("DOE"). First,
7 on June 21, 2012, McNeely submitted a PA request seeking copies of medical records from her
8 childhood on the Hanford nuclear reservation from 1947 through 1953. Defs.' Mot. for Summ. J.
9 ("Defs.' MSJ") 2, Dkt. No. 49 (citing the declaration of DOE employee Dorothy Riele). The DOE
10 conducted a search and located an index card containing McNeely's name and an "X-Ray Record
11 Sheet." Id. at 4–5. The DOE provided these documents and a letter summarizing the results of the
12 search (with the names of third parties redacted). Id. at 5. McNeely appealed and her appeal was
13 denied. Id.

14 Second, on February 2, 2014, McNeely submitted a FOIA request seeking records relating
15 to a study conducted from 1948 to 1952 where she alleges she "was a subject." Id. The DOE
16 conducted a search and did not locate any responsive documents. Id. at 7. McNeely appealed and
17 her appeal was denied. McNeely then filed this action, bringing a variety of claims related to her
18 FOIA/PA requests, as well as claims relating to her childhood medical treatment. First Am.
19 Compl. ("FAC"), Dkt. No. 25.

20 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

21 **A. Summary Judgment**

22 "Summary judgment is proper where no genuine issue of material fact exists and the
23 moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Samuels v. Holland American Line—
24 USA Inc., 656 F.3d 948, 952 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)). The Court "must draw
25 all reasonable inferences in favor of the nonmoving party." Id. "The central issue is 'whether the

26 Case No.: 5:14-cv-03509-EJD

27 ORDER GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, GRANTING
28 GENERAL ELECTRIC'S MOTION TO DISMISS, DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1 evidence presents a sufficient disagreement to require submission to a jury or whether it is so one-
2 sided that one party must prevail as a matter of law.”” *Id.* (quoting *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 251–52 (1986)). Pro se pleadings and motions should be construed liberally.
3
4 *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000).

5 **B. Summary Judgment in FOIA Cases**

6 If an agency withholds information that is responsive to a FOIA request, it must prove that
7 the information falls within a statutory exception to the disclosure requirement. *See Dobronski v. FCC*, 17 F.3d 275, 277 (9th Cir. 1994). The agency may submit affidavits to satisfy its burden, but
8 “the government ‘may not rely upon conclusory and generalized allegations of exemptions.’ ”
9
10 *Kamman v. IRS*, 56 F.3d 46, 48 (9th Cir. 1995) (quoting *Church of Scientology v. U.S. Dep’t of the Army*, 611 F.2d 738, 742 (9th Cir. 1979)). The agency’s “affidavits must contain ‘reasonably detailed descriptions of the documents and allege facts sufficient to establish an exemption.’ ” *Id.*
11
12 (quoting *Lewis v. IRS*, 823 F.2d 375, 378 (9th Cir. 1987)).

13
14 **C. Dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6)**

15 A motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) tests the legal sufficiency of claims
16 alleged in the complaint. *Parks Sch. of Bus., Inc. v. Symington*, 51 F.3d 1480, 1484 (9th Cir.
17 1995). Dismissal “is proper only where there is no cognizable legal theory or an absence of
18 sufficient facts alleged to support a cognizable legal theory.” *Navarro v. Block*, 250 F.3d 729, 732
19 (9th Cir. 2001). The complaint “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a
20 claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’ ” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting
21 *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)).

22
23 **III. DISCUSSION**

24
25 **A. Federal Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment and McNeely’s Motion for
26 Summary Judgment**

27 The Federal Defendants seek summary judgment on McNeely’s FOIA/PA claims, arguing
28 that (1) their search for responsive documents was adequate, (2) information about third parties
Case No.: [5:14-cv-03509-EJD](#)

ORDER GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS, GRANTING
GENERAL ELECTRIC’S MOTION TO DISMISS, DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS’ MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1 was properly withheld, and (3) an individual, Poli A. Marmolejs, is not a proper defendant.

2 First, the Court finds that the Federal Defendants' search was adequate. "In demonstrating
3 the adequacy of the search, the agency may rely upon reasonably detailed, nonconclusory
4 affidavits submitted in good faith." Zemansky v. U.S. E.P.A., 767 F.2d 569, 571 (9th Cir. 1985)
5 (citing Weisberg v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 745 F.2d 1476, 1485 (D.C. Cir. 1984)). Here, the
6 Federal Defendants have met their burden by providing detailed declarations from Amy Rothrock,
7 Dorothy Riehle, and Jonathan Dudley.

8 Second, the Court finds that that Federal Defendants properly withheld information about
9 third parties. Under FOIA's Exemption 6, the government may not disclose "personnel and
10 medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted
11 invasion of personal privacy." 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6). The medical records at issue here are
12 precisely the type of information that Exemption 6 protects from disclosure. McNeely has not
13 demonstrated any public interest that disclosure would serve. See Lahr v. NTSB, 569 F.3d 964,
14 973 (9th Cir. 2009) (holding that courts must "balance the privacy interests protected by the
15 exemptions against the public interest in government openness that would be served by
16 disclosure").

17 Third, the Court finds that Poli A. Marmolejs, an individual, is not a proper defendant.
18 See, e.g., Petrus v. Bowen, 833 F.2d 581, 582 (5th Cir. 1987) ("Neither the Freedom of
19 Information Act nor the Privacy Act creates a cause of action for a suit against an individual
20 employee of a federal agency."); accord Hewett v. Grabicki, 794 F.2d 1373, 1377 (9th Cir. 1986).

21 Accordingly, the federal defendants' motion for summary judgment will be granted. For
22 the same reasons, McNeely's motion for summary judgment will be denied.¹

23

24 ¹ In her motion for summary judgment, McNeely argues that the Federal Defendants should have
25 provided a Vaughn index with its response to her document requests. Dkt. No. 45 at 6. But
26 McNeely has not established that the Federal Defendants were required to do so. See Fiduccia v.
U.S. Dep't of Justice, 185 F.3d 1035, 1042–43 (9th Cir. 1999) ("There is no statutory requirement
27 of a Vaughn index or affidavit. . . . [O]ur precedents plainly hold that neither a Vaughn index nor
Case No.: [5:14-cv-03509-EJD](#)

B. General Electric's Motion to Dismiss

McNeely alleges that General Electric Company (“GE”), and individuals associated with it, are liable for injuries arising from the period when GE was a contractor at Kadlec Hospital. FAC ¶¶ 3, 26–52. GE argues that McNeely’s claims are barred by the doctrine of res judicata because she has already litigated them in another case, In Re Hanford Nuclear Reservation Litigation. Dkt. No. 34 at 3.

Res judicata applies when there is (1) an identity of claims (including claims arising from the same events that could have been brought in the earlier action), (2) a final judgment on the merits, and (3) privity between the parties. Headwaters Inc. v. U.S. Forest Serv., 399 F.3d 1047, 1051–52 (9th Cir. 2005).

The Court agrees that all three factors are satisfied here. First, McNeely asserts the same claims here that she asserted in the earlier litigation. Second, the earlier litigation resulted in a final judgment on the merits. See Dkt. No. 35 Ex. A (attaching the order granting summary judgment against McNeely). Third, GE was also a defendant in the earlier litigation.

Accordingly, GE's motion to dismiss will be granted.

C. Federal Defendants' Motion to Dismiss

In addition to her FOIA/PA claims, McNeely appears to assert various tort claims against government entities arising from medical treatment she received from 1948 to 1953. FAC ¶¶ 26–45. McNeely must pursue her claims under the Federal Tort Claims Act. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2679(b)(1). Actions under the Federal Tort Claims Act must be instituted within two years of accrual by filing a claim with the appropriate administrative agency. 28 U.S.C. § 2401(b). McNeely brought her claims outside of the two-year limitations period. Accordingly, the Court finds that McNeely’s claims (other than her FOIA/PA claims) are untimely and must be dismissed.

an affidavit is necessarily required in all cases.”)

Case No.: 5:14-cv-03509-EJD

Case No.: [3:14-cv-05509-LSD](#)
ORDER GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, GRANTING
GENERAL ELECTRIC'S MOTION TO DISMISS, DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 The Court orders as follows:

3 1. The Federal Defendants' motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 30) is GRANTED.

4 2. GE's motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 34) is GRANTED.

5 3. McNeely's motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 45) is DENIED.

6 4. The Federal Defendants' motion for summary judgment (Dkt. No. 49) is

7 GRANTED.

8 The Clerk shall close this file.

9

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: September 15, 2017



EDWARD J. DAVILA
United States District Judge

26 Case No.: [5:14-cv-03509-EJD](#)
27 ORDER GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS, GRANTING
28 GENERAL ELECTRIC'S MOTION TO DISMISS, DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT, AND GRANTING FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT